arXiv:1203.1500v1 [math.AG] 7 Mar 2012

# A RIGIDITY THEOREM FOR SMALL RESOLUTIONS

MICHELE ROSSI

Abstract. This paper presents a rigidity property of the exceptional locus of some kind of *small* birational contractions. An application in the context of geometric transitions and Calabi–Yau threefolds moduli space is then given, with some physical implication in studying the so–called *Vacuum degeneracy problem*.

## Contents

1. Preliminaries and notation 2
2. The main result 3
3. An example, some remarks and an application 8
3.1. An example 8
3.2. Some remarks 9
3.3. An application 11
References 12

The present paper shows a rigidity property of the exceptional locus of some kind of *small* birational contractions. More precisely if $\widehat{X} \stackrel{\phi}{\to} X$ is a *small resolution* (see Definition 2.1) of a compact normal variety $X$ with isolated rational singularities then, under some technical and rather restrictive hypothesis, the exceptional locus $\mathrm{Exc}(\phi)$ turns out to be rigid under *global* deformations of $\widehat{X}$. More generally the differential localization map $\mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \to H^0(X, R^1\phi_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}})$, induced by the Leray spectral sequence, can be controlled by means of a suitable factorization (see Theorem 2.4). The main technical ingredient of the proof is the direct construction of maps in cohomology $\varphi^\bullet : H^\bullet(Z,\Theta_Z) \to H^\bullet(X,\Theta_X)$, given a small, possibly partial, resolution $Z \stackrel{\varphi}{\to} X$ (see Lemma 2.3).
In the last section this result is applied in the context of geometric transitions and therefore in the study of Calabi–Yau threefolds moduli space, after [23]. Such an application turns out to be of some interest in physics, since geometric transitions connect topologically distinct models of Calabi–Yau vacua giving a sort of "uniqueness" for a space–time model of supersymmetric string theories (see e.g. [1] and references therein).

---

Research partially supported by the Italian Research Grant PRIN (2006) "Geometria delle Varietà Algebriche" (G.V.A.) and by the US N.S.F. Focus Research Grant n. 0139799.

## 1. Preliminaries and notation

In the following we will always work on the complex numbers field $\mathbb{C}$.

Let us recall some well known fact of deformation theory.

Let $\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{f} B$ be a *flat*, surjective map of complex spaces such that $B$ is connected and there exists a special point $o \in B$ whose fibre $X = f^{-1}(o)$ may be singular. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is called *a deformation family of* $X$. If the fibre $X_b = f^{-1}(b)$ is smooth, for some $b \in B$, then $X_b$ is called *a smoothing of* $X$.

Let $\Omega_X$ be the sheaf of holomorphic differential forms on $X$ and consider the *Lichtenbaum–Schlessinger cotangent sheaves* [16] of $X$, $\Theta^i_X = \mathcal{E}xt^i(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$. Then $\Theta^0_X = \mathcal{H}om(\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_X) =: \Theta_X$ is the "tangent" sheaf of $X$ and $\Theta^i_X$ is supported over $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$, for any $i > 0$. Consider the associated *local* and *global deformation objects*

$$T^i_X := H^0(X, \Theta^i_X) \quad , \quad \mathbb{T}^i_X := \mathrm{Ext}^i\left(\Omega^1_X, \mathcal{O}_X\right) \ , \ i = 0, 1, 2.$$

Then by the *local to global spectral sequence* relating the global Ext and sheaf $\mathcal{E}xt$ (see [9] and [6] II, 7.3.3) we get

$$E^{p,q}_2 = H^p(X, \Theta^q_X) \Longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^{p+q}_X$$

giving that

$$\mathbb{T}^0_X \cong T^0_X \cong H^0(X, \Theta_X) \ , \tag{1}$$

$$\text{if } X \text{ is smooth then} \quad \mathbb{T}^i_X \cong H^i(X, \Theta_X) \ , \tag{2}$$

$$\text{if } X \text{ is Stein then} \quad T^i_X \cong \mathbb{T}^i_X \ . \tag{3}$$

Given a deformation family $\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{f} B$ of $X$ *for each point* $b \in B$ *there is a well defined linear (and functorial) map*

$$D_b f : T_b B \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^1_{X_b} \qquad \text{(Generalized Kodaira–Spencer map)}$$

(see e.g. [21] Theorem 5.1). Recall that $\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{f} B$ is called

- a *versal* deformation family of $X$ if for any deformation family $(\mathcal{Y}, X) \xrightarrow{g} (C, 0)$ of $X$ there exists a map of pointed complex spaces $h : (U, 0) \to (B, o)$, defined on a neighborhood $0 \in U \subset C$, such that $\mathcal{Y}|_U$ is the *pull–back* of $\mathcal{X}$ by $h$ i.e.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \mathcal{Y}|_U = U \times_h \mathcal{X} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "g"] & \mathcal{X} \arrow[d, "f"] \\
C & U \arrow[l, hook'] \arrow[r, "h"] & B
\end{tikzcd}$$

- an *effective versal* deformation family of $X$ if it is versal and the generalized Kodaira–Spencer map evaluated at $o \in B$, $D_o f : T_o B \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^1_X$ is injective,
- a *universal* family if it is versal and $h$ is univocally defined in a neighborhood $0 \in U \subset C$.

**Theorem 1.1** (Douady–Grauert–Palamodov [3], [7], [20] and [21] Theorems 5.4 and 5.6)**.** *Every compact complex space* $X$ *has an effective versal deformation* $\mathcal{X} \xrightarrow{f} B$ *which is a proper map and a versal deformation of each of its fibers. Moreover the germ of analytic space* $(B, o)$ *is isomorphic to the germ of analytic space* $(q^{-1}(0), 0)$, *where* $q : \mathbb{T}^1_X \to \mathbb{T}^2_X$ *is a suitable holomorphic map (the* obstruction map*) such that* $q(0) = 0$*.*

In particular if $q \equiv 0$ (e.g. when $\mathbb{T}^2_X = 0$) then $(B, o)$ turns out to be isomorphic to the germ of a neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{T}^1_X$.

**Definition 1.2** (Kuranishi space and number)**.** The germ of analytic space

$$\mathrm{Def}(X) := (B, o)$$

as defined in Theorem 1.1, is called the *Kuranishi space of* $X$. The *Kuranishi number* $\mathrm{def}(X)$ *of* $X$ is then the maximum dimension of irreducible components of $\mathrm{Def}(X)$.
$\mathrm{Def}(X)$ is said to be *unobstructed* or *smooth* if the obstruction map $q$ is the constant map $q \equiv 0$. In this case $\mathrm{def}(X) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{T}^1_X$.

## 2. The main result

Let us first of all recall what is intended for a *small* resolution of singularities.

**Definition 2.1** (Small resolution)**.** A *small (partial) resolution* of singularities of a compact $n$–dimensional variety $Z$ is a birational morphism $\varphi : X \longrightarrow Z$ which is a (partial) resolution of singularities and such that

$$\mathrm{codim}_X(\mathrm{Exc}(\varphi)) \geq 2 \ ,$$

where $\mathrm{Exc}(\varphi)$ represents the exceptional locus of $\varphi$.

The following result is a first useful technical tool, obtained by a higher dimensional generalization of Freedman's techniques in [4].

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let* $M \xrightarrow{\sigma} V$ *be a small, possibly partial, resolution of a normal compact* $n$*–dimensional variety* $V$ *with rational isolated singularities. Let* $U_p$ *be a germ of complex space locally representing the singularity* $p \in V$ *and set* $L_p := \sigma^{-1}(U_p) \subset M$*. Then, by setting* $P := \mathrm{Sing}(V)$*,*

1. $\mathbb{T}^1_{L_p} \cong H^1\left(L_p, \Theta_{L_p}\right) \cong H^0\left(U_p, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p}\right)$ *and* $H^0\left(V, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M\right)$ *turns out to be the tangent space to* $\prod_{p\in P} \mathrm{Def}(L_p)$*,*
2. $\mathbb{T}^1_{U_p} \cong T^1_{U_p}$ *and* $T^1_V$ *turns out to be the tangent space to* $\prod_{p\in P} \mathrm{Def}(U_p)$
3. *the following commutative diagram with exact rows is well defined*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_V) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathbb{T}^1_M \arrow[r, "\kappa"] \arrow[d, "\delta_1"] & H^0\left(R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M\right) \arrow[r, "d_2"] \arrow[d, "\delta_{loc}"] & H^2\left(\Theta_V\right) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathbb{T}^2_M \arrow[d, "\delta_2"] \\
0 \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_V) \arrow[r] & \mathbb{T}^1_V \arrow[r, "\lambda"] & T^1_V \arrow[r] & H^2\left(\Theta_V\right) \arrow[r] & \mathbb{T}^2_V
\end{tikzcd}$$

*where* $\delta_1, \delta_{loc}, \delta_2$ *are maps induced by the resolution* $\sigma$ *and in particular* $\delta_1$ *and* $\delta_{loc}$ *turn out to be injective.*

*Proof.* To prove (1) and (2) observe that $L_p$ is smooth and the local to global spectral sequence allows to conclude that $\mathbb{T}^1_{L_p} \cong H^1\left(L_p, \Theta_{L_p}\right)$. Apply now the Leray spectral sequence for the cohomology of $\Theta_{L_p}$, whose lower terms exact sequence gives

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1\left(R^0\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p}\right) \longrightarrow H^1\left(\Theta_{L_p}\right) \longrightarrow H^0\left(R^1\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p}\right) \longrightarrow H^2\left(R^0\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p}\right)$$

As a consequence of Hartogs' Theorem $R^0\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p} \cong \Theta_{U_p}$ (see [4], Lemma (3.1)) and $H^i(\Theta_{U_p}) = 0$, for $i > 0$, since $U_p$ is Stein.
On the other hand the lower terms exact sequence of the local to global spectral sequence gives

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & H^1\left(\Theta_{U_p}\right) \arrow[r] & \mathbb{T}^1_{U_p} \arrow[r] & T^1_{U_p} \arrow[r] & H^2\left(\Theta_{U_p}\right) \end{tikzcd}$$

and we can conclude as before. The complete statements (1) and (2) can now be obtained as an easy application of the local cohomology sequence

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & H^0_P\left(V,\mathcal{F}\right) \arrow[r] & H^0\left(V,\mathcal{F}\right) \arrow[r] & H^0\left(V^*,\mathcal{F}\right) \arrow[r] & H^1_P\left(V,\mathcal{F}\right) \arrow[r] & \cdots \end{tikzcd} \tag{4}$$

where $P := \mathrm{Sing}(V)$, $V^* = V \setminus P$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is given either by $R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M$ or by $\Theta^1_V = \mathcal{E}xt^1(\Omega^1_V, \mathcal{O}_V)$ . Precisely, for $\mathcal{F} = R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M$, by the Theorem on Formal Functions, we get

$$\begin{array}{rrcl} & H^0\left(V^*, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M\right) & = & 0 \\ \forall p \in P & H^0\left(U^*_p, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p}\right) & = & 0 \end{array} \tag{5}$$

since $\sigma|_{M\setminus \mathrm{Exc}(\sigma)}$, is an isomorphism. Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} H^0\left(V, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M\right) & \cong & H^0_P\left(V, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M\right) \\ & \cong & \bigoplus_{p\in P} H^0_p\left(U_p, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p}\right) \\ & \cong & \bigoplus_{p\in P} H^0\left(U_p, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_{L_p}\right) \cong \bigoplus_{p\in P} \mathbb{T}^1_{L_p} \end{array}$$

where the first row is obtained by applying the first vanishing in (5), the second row is an application of the Excision Theorem ([10] Prop. I.2.2) and the last row is obtained by the second vanishing in (5) and the localization of (4) near to $p$.
On the other hand, for $\mathcal{F} = \Theta^1_V$, we get

$$\begin{array}{rrcl} & H^0\left(V^*, \Theta^1_V\right) & = & 0 \\ \forall p \in P & H^0\left(U^*_p, \Theta^1_{U_p}\right) & = & 0 \end{array}$$

since the sheaf $\Theta^1_V$ is supported on $P = \mathrm{Sing}(V)$. Then, as before, we get

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T^1_V = H^0\left(V, \Theta^1_V\right) & \cong & H^0_P\left(V, \Theta^1_V\right) \\ & \cong & \bigoplus_{p\in P} H^0_p\left(U_p, \Theta^1_{U_p}\right) \\ & \cong & \bigoplus_{p\in P} H^0\left(U_p, \Theta^1_{U_p}\right) \cong \bigoplus_{p\in P} T^1_{U_p} \ . \end{array}$$

The diagram in statement (3) arises as follows. The upper exact row is the lower terms exact sequence of the Leray spectral sequence for the cohomology of $\Theta_M$ by recalling that (2) holds since $M$ is smooth. The lower row is the lower terms exact sequence of the local to global spectral sequence converging to $\mathbb{T}^i_V$. Maps $\delta_1, \delta_{loc}, \delta_2$ arise naturally, keeping in mind results (1) and (2), as differentials of the commutative localization diagram (18), which can be rewritten in present notation as follows

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Def}(M) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{Def}(L_p) \arrow[d] \\
\mathrm{Def}(V) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Def}(U_p)
\end{tikzcd}$$

Notice that vertical maps are well defined since $\sigma$ is a small resolution of isolated rational singularities giving $\sigma_*\mathcal{O}_M \cong \mathcal{O}_V$ and $R^1\sigma_*\mathcal{O}_M = 0$ (see [15] Proposition (11.4)). About the injectivity of $\delta_1$ and $\delta_{loc}$ observe that if $\delta_{loc}$ is injective it is easy to prove that $\delta_1$ is injective too. To prove that $\delta_{loc}$ is injective we will repeat here an argument of R. Friedmann (see [4] Proposition (2.1), (2)). Let us first of all recall the following result of M. Schlessinger (see [27] Theorem 2)

$$T^1_{U_p} \cong H^1(U^*_p, \Theta_{U_p}) \tag{6}$$

where $U^*_p := U_p \setminus \{p\}$ . Set

$$U^* := \left(\bigcup_{p\in P} U_p\right) \setminus P \quad \text{and} \quad L^* := \left(\bigcup_{p\in P} L_p\right) \setminus E$$

where $E := \mathrm{Exc}(\sigma)$. Isomorphisms $L^* \xrightarrow[\cong]{\sigma} U^*$ and (6) and statements (1) and (2), allow then to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
H^0\left(V, R^1\sigma_*\Theta_M\right) &\cong \bigoplus_{p\in P} \mathbb{T}^1_{L_p} \cong H^1\left(L, \Theta_L\right) \\
T^1_V &\cong \bigoplus_{p\in P} T^1_{U_p} \cong H^1\left(U^*, \Theta_U\right) \cong H^1\left(L^*, \Theta_L\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and $\delta_{loc}$ can then be obtained by the local cohomology exact sequence

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & H^0_E\left(L, \Theta_L\right) \arrow[r] & H^0\left(L, \Theta_L\right) \arrow[r] & H^0\left(L^*, \Theta_L\right) \arrow[dll] \\
& H^1_E\left(L, \Theta_L\right) \arrow[r] & H^1\left(L, \Theta_L\right) \arrow[r, "\delta_{loc}"] & H^1\left(L^*, \Theta_L\right) \arrow[r] & \cdots
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since $\mathrm{codim}_L E \geq 2$, Hartogs' Theorem gives $H^0\left(V, \Theta_L\right) \cong H^0\left(V \cap L^*, \Theta_L\right)$ for any open subset $V \subset L$. Then

$$\ker(\delta_{loc}) = H^1_E\left(L, \Theta_L\right) = 0 \ ,$$

whose vanishing can be deduced by [10] Proposition 2.13. □

A second useful technical tool is the following

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let $X$ be a normal compact $n$–dimensional variety with isolated rational singularities and $\varphi : Z \longrightarrow X$ be a small (partial) resolution of $X$. Then $\varphi$ induces well defined maps in cohomology*

$$\varphi^\bullet : H^\bullet(Z, \Theta_Z) \longrightarrow H^\bullet(X, \Theta_X) \ .$$

*Proof.* Observe that Proposition II.8.11 in [11] ensures the existence of a map of sheaves $f : \varphi^*\Omega_X \longrightarrow \Omega_Z$. Then, applying the contra-variant functor $\mathcal{H}om\,(\,\cdot\,, \mathcal{O}_Z)$, we get a map $\check{f} : \Theta_Z \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}om(\varphi^*\Omega_X, \mathcal{O}_Z)$. For any open subset $U \subseteq Z$, call $\widehat{U} := \varphi^{-1} \circ \varphi(U)$. Then $\check{f}$ induces the following map of $\mathcal{O}_Z(\widehat{U})$–modules:

$$\Theta_Z(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Z(\widehat{U})}\left(\varphi^*\Omega_X(\widehat{U}), \mathcal{O}_Z(\widehat{U})\right) \ . \tag{7}$$

Observe now that $\varphi$ is an *open* map, since it is a resolution of singularities. Moreover $X$ admits only terminal isolated singularities, giving $\varphi_*\mathcal{O}_Z \cong \mathcal{O}_X$. Then

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Z(\widehat{U})}\left(\varphi^*\Omega_X(\widehat{U}), \mathcal{O}_Z(\widehat{U})\right) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(\varphi(U))}\left(\Omega_X(\varphi(U)), \mathcal{O}_X(\varphi(U))\right) \ . \tag{8}$$

Ultimately notice that the restriction map $\rho^{\widehat{U}}_U : \Theta_Z(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow \Theta_Z(U)$ is actually an isomorphism: it is injective since sections vanishing everywhere except over $\mathrm{Exc}(\varphi)$ cannot be holomorphic and it is surjective by Hartogs Theorem and the hypothesis that $\varphi$ is *small*. Combining the latter with (7) and (8) gives, for any open subset $U \subseteq Z$, the following map

$$\varphi_U : \ \Theta_Z(U) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X(\varphi(U))}\left(\Omega_X(\varphi(U)), \mathcal{O}_X(\varphi(U))\right) =: \Theta_X\left(\varphi(U)\right)$$

By inductive limit one gets well defined maps on stalks

$$\forall z \in Z \quad \varphi_z : \ \Theta_{Z,z} \longrightarrow \Theta_{X,\varphi(z)}$$

To induce a map in cohomology, let us then consider canonical resolutions of $\Theta_Z$ and $\Theta_X$, respectively (see [6], II.4.3)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \Theta_Z \arrow[r] & \Theta_Z^{[0]} \arrow[r] & \Theta_Z^{[1]} \arrow[r] & \Theta_Z^{[2]} \arrow[r] & \cdots \\
0 \arrow[r] & \Theta_X \arrow[r] & \Theta_X^{[0]} \arrow[r] & \Theta_X^{[1]} \arrow[r] & \Theta_X^{[2]} \arrow[r] & \cdots
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\Theta^{[i]}$ is the sheaf of *not necessarily continuous sections of* $\Theta^{[i-1]}$, which is

$$\Theta^{[i]}(U) = \prod_{x \in U} \Theta_x^{[i-1]} \ ,$$

for any open subset $U$ in $Z$ or $X$, $i \geq 0$ and setting $\Theta^{[-1]} = \Theta$. By applying the left exact functors of global sections we get then

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \Gamma\left(Z, \Theta_Z\right) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_Z"] & \Gamma\left(Z, \Theta_Z^{[0]}\right) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_\sharp"] & \Gamma\left(Z, \Theta_Z^{[1]}\right) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_\sharp"] & \cdots \\
0 \arrow[r] & \Gamma\left(X, \Theta_X\right) \arrow[r] & \Gamma\left(X, \Theta_X^{[0]}\right) \arrow[r] & \Gamma\left(X, \Theta_X^{[1]}\right) \arrow[r] & \cdots
\end{tikzcd} \tag{9}$$

where maps $\varphi_\sharp$'s are defined stalk by stalk by observing that $\varphi$ is surjective. Since every square in diagram (9) commutes there follow well defined maps in cohomology $\varphi^\bullet : H^\bullet(Z, \Theta_Z) \longrightarrow H^\bullet(X, \Theta_X)$. ☐

We are now in a position to prove our main result, which is the following

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let $X$ be a normal compact $n$–dimensional variety with isolated rational singularities and suppose there exists a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\widehat{X} \arrow[rr, "\phi"] \arrow[dr, "\gamma"] & & X \\
& Z \arrow[ur, "\varphi"] &
\end{tikzcd} \tag{10}$$

*of small (partial)* non–trivial *resolutions of $X$ such that $\widehat{X}$ is smooth and the natural morphism*

$$\kappa : \mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \twoheadrightarrow H^0(Z, R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}) \ ,$$

*induced by the Leray spectral sequence, is surjective. Then the differential localization map*

$$\widehat{\lambda} : \mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \longrightarrow H^0(X, R^1\phi_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}})$$

*factorizes giving rise to the following commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \arrow[r, "\widehat{\lambda}"] \arrow[d, "\kappa"] & H^0(X, R^1\phi_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}) \arrow[d, hook, "\delta^X_{loc}"] \\
H^0(Z, R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}) \arrow[r, "\delta"] & T^1_X
\end{tikzcd} \ . \tag{11}$$

*In particular, if $Z$ admits only nodal singularities then $\widehat{\lambda}$ is necessarily the 0 map meaning that the (small) exceptional locus* $\mathrm{Exc}(\phi)$ *turns out to be rigid under* global *deformations of $\widehat{X}$.*

*Proof.* Apply Lemma 2.2 by setting $M = \widehat{X}$ and either $\sigma = \phi$ or $\sigma = \gamma$. Then there follow commutative diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \arrow[r, "\widehat{\lambda}"] \arrow[d, hook, "\delta^X_1"] & H^0\left(X, R^1\phi_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}\right) \arrow[d, hook, "\delta^X_{loc}"] \\
\mathbb{T}^1_X \arrow[r, "\lambda"] & T^1_X
\end{tikzcd} \quad , \quad
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \arrow[r, two heads, "\kappa"] \arrow[d, hook, "\delta^Z_1"] & H^0\left(Z, R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}\right) \arrow[d, hook, "\delta^Z_{loc}"] \\
\mathbb{T}^1_Z \arrow[r, "\lambda_Z"] & T^1_Z
\end{tikzcd} \tag{12}$$

Since $Z \xrightarrow{\varphi} X$ is a (partial) resolution, it is well defined a map $\delta_1 : \mathbb{T}^1_Z \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^1_X$ as differential of a map between Kuranishi spaces (see [29] Theorem 1.4.(c) and [15] Proposition (11.4)) which fits in the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \arrow[rr, hook, "\delta^X_1"] \arrow[dr, hook, "\delta^Z_1"] & & \mathbb{T}^1_X \\
& \mathbb{T}^1_Z \arrow[ur, "\delta_1"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then we get a commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_Z) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}} \arrow[r, two heads, "\kappa"] \arrow[d, hook, "\delta_1^Z"'] \arrow[dd, bend left, "\delta_1^X"] & H^0\left(R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}\right) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook, "\delta^Z_{loc}"'] \arrow[dd, bend left, "\delta"] & \cdots \\
0 \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_Z) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi^1"] & \mathbb{T}^1_Z \arrow[r, "\lambda_Z"] \arrow[d, "\delta_1"'] & T^1_Z \arrow[r] & \cdots \\
0 \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_X) \arrow[r, "j"] & \mathbb{T}^1_X \arrow[r, "\lambda"] & T^1_X \arrow[r] & \cdots
\end{tikzcd} \tag{13}$$

where the first row is given by the Leray spectral sequence converging to $H^\bullet(\widehat{X},\Theta_{\widehat{X}})$, by recalling that $R^0\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}\cong\Theta_Z$ (see [4] Lemma (3.1)), while the latter two are obtained by local to global spectral sequences. The vertical map $\varphi^1 : H^1(Z,\Theta_Z)\longrightarrow H^1(X,\Theta_X)$ is defined in the previous Lemma 2.3. The vertical map $\delta$ is easily induced by the composition $\delta_1^X=\delta_1\circ\delta_1^Z$ as follows: since $\kappa$ is surjective, for any $x\in H^0\left(R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}\right)$ set $\delta(x):=\lambda\circ\delta_1^X(y)$, for $y\in\kappa^{-1}(x)$. This is well defined since $y,y'\in\kappa^{-1}(x)$ give $y-y'\in\operatorname{Im}(i)$. Then, by commutativity and exactness, $\delta_1^X(y)-\delta_1^X(y')=j\circ\varphi^1(y-y')\in\ker(\lambda)$. Recalling the first diagram in (12) we can then conclude the existence of the commutative diagram (11).
To prove the second part of the statement observe that if $\operatorname{Sing}(Z)$ is composed only by nodes then $\kappa$ is surjective since $h^0(Z,R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}})=0$ (see [4] (3.5.1)). In particular, (11) makes $\widehat{\lambda}=0$, since $\delta^X_{loc}$ is injective. □

## 3. An example, some remarks and an application

3.1. **An example.** Let us consider the previous result in the case of the *fibred self–product* of a particular rational elliptic surface with section $Y\to\mathbb{P}^1$, obtaining a local to global picture of an observation of Y.Namikawa ([19] Remark 2.8).

Let us first of all recall that a *rational elliptic surface with sections* is a rational surface $Y$ admitting an elliptic fibrations over $\mathbb{P}^1$, $r:Y\longrightarrow\mathbb{P}^1$, with distinguished section $\sigma_0$ (notation as in [26] and [18]). If the generic fiber of $r$ is smooth then $Y$ admits a *Weierstrass representation* (see [13] Theorem 1, [17] Theorem 2.1, [12] §2.1 and proof of prop. 2.1): in fact $\sigma(\mathbb{P}^1)$ is a $(-1)$–curve in $Y$ (see [17] Proposition (2.3) and Corollary (2.4)) and there exist $A\in H^0(\mathbb{P}^1,\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(4))$ and $B\in H^0(\mathbb{P}^1,\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(6))$ such that $Y$ is isomorphic to the closed subschema of the projectivized bundle $\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(3)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}\right)$ defined by the zero locus of the homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{lcccc}
(A,B) & : & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(3)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(6) \\
 & & (x,y,z) & \longmapsto & -x^2z+y^3+A\ yz^2+B\ z^3\ .
\end{array} \tag{14}$$

The pair $(A,B)$ (hence the homomorphism (14)) is uniquely determined up to the transformation $(A,B)\mapsto(c^4A,c^6B)$, $c\in\mathbb{C}^*$ and the *discriminant form* $\delta:=4\ A^3+27\ B^2\in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(12))$ vanishes at a point $\lambda\in\mathbb{P}^1$ if and only if the fiber $Y_\lambda:=r^{-1}(\lambda)$ is singular. In general the singular fibers are nodal and $\operatorname{Sing}(X)$ is composed by a finite number $\nu=12$ of distinct nodes.

Let us now consider the Y. Namikawa's example ([19], §0.1) of a Weierstrass fibration associated with the bundles homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{lcccc}
(0,B) & : & \mathcal{E}=\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(3)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(6) \\
 & & (x,y,z) & \longmapsto & -x^2z+y^3+B(\lambda)\ z^3
\end{array} \tag{15}$$

i.e. its zero locus $Y \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. The associated discriminant form is $\delta(\lambda) = 27B(\lambda)^2 \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(12))$ whose roots are precisely those of $B \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(6))$. Hence, for a generic $B$, the rational elliptic surface $Y \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ has smooth generic fiber and six distinct cuspidal fibers. Therefore the fiber product $X := Y \times_{\mathbb{P}^1} Y$ is a threefold admitting 6 *threefold cups* whose local type is described by the germ of singularity

$$X^2 - U^2 - Y^3 + V^3 \in \mathbb{C}[X, Y, U, V] \ . \tag{16}$$

In the standard Kodaira notation these are singularities of type $II \times II$ ([14], Theorem 6.2). Namikawa proved the following

**Proposition 3.1** ([19] §0.1)**.** *The* cuspidal fiber product $X = Y \times_{\mathbb{P}^1} Y$ *associated with the Weierstrass fibration $Y$, defined as the zero locus in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ of the bundles homomorphism (15), admits six small resolutions which are connected to each other by flops of $(-1,-1)$–curves. The exceptional locus of any such resolution is given by six disjoint couples of $(-1,-1)$–curves intersecting in one point.*

Recall that a $(-1,-1)$–*curve* in $X$ is a rational curve whose normal bundle is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)$. It arises precisely as exceptional locus of the resolution of an ordinary double point. In fact if $\phi : \widehat{X} \to X$ is anyone of the six small resolutions given by the previous Proposition 3.1 then it factorizes like in diagram (10) where $\varphi : Z \to X$ is given by a partial nodal simultaneous resolution of the six cusps of $X$. Then $h^0(Z, R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}}) = 0$ and applying the Theorem 2.4 we get *the rigidity under global deformation of $\widehat{X}$ of the six $A_2$ trees of rational curves giving* $\mathrm{Exc}(\phi)$.

### 3.2. Some remarks.

*Remark* 3.2. Observe that compactness hypothesis for $X$ in the statement of Theorem 2.4 is necessary since the latter gives a rigidity property of $\mathrm{Exc}(\phi)$ under *global* deformations of the resolution $\widehat{X}$: locally Theorem 2.4 is not true as the Namikawa example shows. In fact consider the following *localization near to any cusp* $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(X)$

$$\begin{tikzcd} \widehat{U}_p := \phi^{-1}(U_p) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, "\phi_p"] & \widehat{X} \arrow[d, "\phi"] \\ U_p := \mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}_{F,p} \arrow[r, hook] & X \end{tikzcd} \tag{17}$$

which induces the following commutative diagram between Kuranishi spaces

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{Def}(\widehat{X}) \arrow[r, "\widehat{\lambda}_p"] \arrow[d, hook, "\delta"] & \mathrm{Def}(\widehat{U}_p) \arrow[d, hook, "\delta_{loc}"] \\ \mathrm{Def}(X) \arrow[r, "\lambda_p"] & \mathrm{Def}(U_p) \cong T^1 \end{tikzcd} \tag{18}$$

where the horizontal maps are the natural localization maps while the vertical maps are *injective maps* induced by the resolution $\phi$ (see [29] Propositions 1.8 and 1.12, [15] Proposition (11.4)). Since $\mathrm{def}(\widehat{U}_p) = 1$ (see [19], Remark 2.8) then $\mathrm{Im}(\delta_{loc}) \subset T^1_{U_p}$ describes non–trivial local deformations of $\widehat{U}_p$ along which $Exc(\phi_p)$, as in diagram (17), is not rigid. E.g. consider the following local deformation of the cusp (16)

$$(X-U)(X+U)=(Y-V+\alpha)(Y-\epsilon V+\beta)(Y-\epsilon^2V+\gamma)\ , \tag{19}$$

where $\epsilon^3=1$, and the following local resolution of the same singularity

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(X-U) &= \mu_0(Y-V)\\ \nu_1(X+U) &= \nu_0(Y-\epsilon V)\\ \mu_0\nu_0 &= \mu_1\nu_1(Y-\epsilon^2V) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

in $\mathbb{C}^4(X,Y,U,V)\times\mathbb{P}^1[\mu]\times\mathbb{P}^1[\nu]$, which deforms along (19) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(X-U) &= \mu_0(Y-V+\alpha)\\ \nu_1(X+U) &= \nu_0(Y-\epsilon V+\beta)\\ \mu_0\nu_0 &= \mu_1\nu_1(Y-\epsilon^2V+\gamma) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The singular locus of the generic fibre in (19) is composed by the following three nodes

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 = &\ \left(0,\tfrac{\epsilon\alpha-\beta}{1-\epsilon},0,\tfrac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\epsilon}\right)\\ p_2 = &\ \left(0,\tfrac{\epsilon\beta-\gamma}{1-\epsilon},0,\tfrac{\beta-\gamma}{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}\right)\\ p_3 = &\ \left(0,\tfrac{\epsilon^2\alpha-\gamma}{1-\epsilon^2},0,\tfrac{\alpha-\gamma}{1-\epsilon^2}\right)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

While the exceptional fibre $Exc(\phi_p)$ of (20) over the cusp (16) is described by the closed subset $\{\mu_0\nu_0=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}^1[\mu]\times\mathbb{P}^1[\nu]$, giving a couple of $\mathbb{P}^1$'s meeting in a point, the exceptional fibre of (21) over the node $p_j$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{ll} \{\mu_0\nu_0=k(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)\mu_1\nu_1\}\subset\mathbb{P}^1[\mu]\times\mathbb{P}^1[\nu] & \text{for } j=1\ ,\\ \{\mu_0=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}^1[\mu]\times\mathbb{P}^1[\nu] & \text{for } j=2\ ,\\ \{\nu_0=0\}\subset\mathbb{P}^1[\mu]\times\mathbb{P}^1[\nu] & \text{for } j=3\ , \end{array}$$

where $k(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$ is the evaluation of $(Y-\epsilon^2V+\gamma)$ over $p_1$. Then the exceptional locus $Exc(\phi_p)$ over the cusp (16) has been locally deformed to a tern of $\mathbb{P}^1$'s although (20) factors through a partial nodal resolution of (16), giving a local counterexample to Theorem 2.4.

*Remark* 3.3. *Non–trivial* resolutions of $X$ in the statement of Theorem 2.4 means that none of the birational morphisms in diagram (10) is an isomorphism. In fact, on the one hand, if either $\phi$ or $\varphi$ is an isomorphisms there is nothing to prove. On the other hand if $\gamma$ is an isomorphism the construction in (13) trivializes and a commutative diagram like (11) can no more be obtained.

*Remark* 3.4. Let us briefly discuss the surjectivity hypothesis for the morphism

$$\kappa:\mathbb{T}^1_{\widehat{X}}\twoheadrightarrow H^0(Z,R^1\gamma_*\Theta_{\widehat{X}})\ ,$$

given in the statement of Theorem 2.4. It is just a technical hypothesis needed to construct the key-map $\delta$. It could be dropped if we were able to exhibit a well defined map $\tau:T^1_Z\to T^1_X$. In fact in this case we would immediately get $\delta:=\tau\circ\delta^Z_{loc}$ and diagram (11) would then follow, without need of constructing the map $\varphi^1$. Unfortunately [29] and [15] cannot be applied to guarantee the existence of $\tau$, as it was done to construct maps $\delta^Z_{loc},\delta^X_{loc}$, since we are in presence of a not necessarily *proper* map between the underlying Kuranishi spaces.

*Remark* 3.5. Let us point out a nice consequence of the previous Lemma 2.3. In the same hypothesis as above, the Leray spectral sequence of $\varphi_*\Theta_Z$ gives the following exact sequence:
(23)

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_X) \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_Z) \arrow[r] & H^0(R^1\varphi_*\Theta_Z) \arrow[r, "d_2"] & H^2(\Theta_X) \arrow[r] & H^2(\Theta_Z) \end{tikzcd}$$

where $d_2 : H^0(R^1\varphi_*\Theta_Z) = E_2^{0,1} \longrightarrow H^2(\Theta_X) = E_2^{2,0}$ is the differential $d_2$ of the Leray spectral sequence. Notice that the if $\dim(\mathrm{Exc}(\varphi)) \leq 1$ then the last map $E_2^{2,0} = H^2(\Theta_X) \longrightarrow H^2(\Theta_Z)$ is surjective, since $R^1\varphi_*\Theta_Z$ is supported over $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$ and $R^2\varphi_*\Theta_Z = 0$ giving

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = H^1(R^1\varphi_*\Theta_Z) = E_2^{1,1} \quad &\Rightarrow \quad E_\infty^{1,1} = 0 \ , \\ 0 = H^0(R^2\varphi_*\Theta_Z) = E_2^{0,2} \quad &\Rightarrow \quad E_\infty^{0,2} = 0 \ . \end{aligned}$$

Then maps defined in Lemma 2.3 split the exact sequence (23) in the following two splitting short exact sequences

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_X) \arrow[r] & H^1(\Theta_Z) \arrow[l, bend right, swap, "\varphi^1"] \arrow[r] & \ker d_2 \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Im}\, d_2 \arrow[r] & H^2(\Theta_X) \arrow[r] & H^2(\Theta_Z) \arrow[l, bend right, swap, "\varphi^2"] \arrow[r, "(*)"] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

where $(*)$ refers to the case $\dim(\mathrm{Exc}(\varphi)) \leq 1$. Then we get the following conclusion:

- *let $X$ be a normal compact $n$–dimensional variety with rational isolated singularities and $Z \xrightarrow{\varphi} X$ be a small (partial) resolution of $X$ and consider $E_2^{0,1} \xrightarrow{d_2} E_2^{2,0}$ in the Leray spectral sequence of $\varphi_*\Theta_Z$; then there exist natural decompositions on the cohomology of $\Theta_Z$:*

$$H^1(Z,\Theta_Z) \cong H^1(X,\Theta_X) \oplus \ker d_2 \tag{24}$$

$$\text{if } \dim(\mathrm{Exc}(\varphi)) \leq 1 \text{ then } \quad H^2(X,\Theta_X) \cong \mathrm{Im}\, d_2 \oplus H^2(Z,\Theta_Z) \ . \tag{25}$$

*In particular* (25) *is always true when $X$ is a compact threefold with isolated rational singularities, since $\varphi$ is a* small *resolution.*

3.3. **An application.** Let us recall that a *geometric transition* (g.t.) between two Calabi–Yau threefolds $\widehat{X}, \widetilde{X}$ is the process $T(\widehat{X}, X, \widetilde{X})$ obtained by "composing" a birational contraction $\phi : \widehat{X} \to X$ to a normal threefold $X$, with a complex smoothing of $X$ admitting $\widetilde{X}$ as a smooth fibre (see [24], Definition 1.4). If the normal intermediate threefold $X$ has only nodal singularities then the considered g.t. is called a *conifold transition.* The interest in g.t.s goes back to the ideas of H. Clemens [2] and M. Reid [23] which gave rise to the so called *Calabi–Yau Web Conjecture* (see also [8] for a revised and more recent version) stating that (more or less) all Calabi–Yau threefolds can be connected to each other by means of a chain of g.t.s, giving a sort of (unexpected) "connectedness" of the Calabi–Yau threefolds moduli space. There is also a considerable physical interest in g.t.s owing to the fact that they connect topologically distinct models of Calabi–Yau vacua: the physical version of the Calabi–Yau Web Conjecture is a sort of (in this case expected) "uniqueness" of a space–time model for supersymmetric string theories (see e.g. [1] and references therein). Although a conifold transition is quite well known both mathematically, as a topological surgery after H. Clemens [2], and physically, as a black hole condensation after A. Strominger [28], the geometry and physics of a general g.t. can be very intricate and actually not understood at all (see [25] for some partial result).

Let us say that two g.t.s are *deformation equivalent* (def-equivalent) if their birational contractions are connected by a morphism deformation in the sense of [22], generalizing the same notion between algebraic surfaces, introduced in [5]. For a g.t. $T(\widehat{X},X,\widetilde{X})$ to be def-equivalent to a conifold transition gives rise to strong consequences both mathematically and physically. In particular the Strominger interpretation of a conifold transition can be smoothly extended to $T(\widehat{X},X,\widetilde{X})$. One can ask if *a g.t. is always def-equivalent to a conifold transition.* Unfortunately this is not the case: in fact Theorem 2.4 ensures that if the birational contraction $\phi:\widehat{X}\to X$ admits a non-trivial factorization through a nodal threefold $Z$, then $\phi$ can't be deformed to the contraction of disjoint $(-1,-1)$–curves. A concrete example can be obtained by letting $X$ be the Namikawa's fibred product previously described in 3.1, whose resolution $\widehat{X}$, given in Proposition 3.1, turns out to be a Calabi–Yau threefold (see the Example in the Introduction of [19]). If $\widetilde{X}$ is a general bi-cubic in $\mathbb{P}^2\times\mathbb{P}^2$ giving a smoothing of $X$ then the g.t. $T(\widehat{X},X,\widetilde{X})$ cannot be def-equivalent to a conifold transition.

## REFERENCES

[1] Candelas P., Green P.S. and Hübsch T. “Rolling among Calabi–Yau vacua” *Nucl. Phys.* **B330** (1990), 49–102.

[2] Clemens C.H. “Double Solids” *Adv. in Math.* **47** (1983), 107–230.

[3] Douady A. “Le problème des modules locaux pour les espaces C–analytiques compacts” *Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.* 4e série, **7** 569–602 (1974).

[4] Friedman R. “Simultaneous resolution of threefold double points” *Math. Ann.* **247** (1986), 671–689.

[5] Friedman R. and Morgan J.W. “Algebraic surfaces and four-manifolds: some conjectures and speculations” *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **18** (1988), 1–19.

[6] Godement R. *Topologie Algébrique et Théorie des Faisceaux*, Hermann, Paris (1958).

[7] Grauert H. “Der Satz von Kuranishi für Kompakte Komplexe Räume” *Invent.Math.* **25**, 107–142 (1974).

[8] Gross M. “Primitive Calabi–Yau threefolds” *J. Diff. Geom.* **45** (1997), 288–318; `math.AG/9512002`.

[9] Grothendieck A. “Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique” *Tôhoku Math. J.* **9**, 199–221 (1957).

[10] Grothendieck A. *Cohomologie locale des faisceaux cohérents et théorèmes de Lefschetz locaux et globaux (SGA 2)* Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie, 1962. Revised reprint of the 1968 French original. Documents Mathématiques (Paris) Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2005.

[11] Hartshorne R. *Algebraic Geometry* G.T.M. **52**, Springer–Verlag, Berlin–Hidelberg–New York (1977).

[12] Heckman G. and Looijenga E. *The moduli space of rational elliptic surfaces*, Algebraic geometry 2000, Azumino (Hotaka), Adv. Stud. Pure Math., **36** (2002), 185–248.

[13] Kas A. “Weierstrass normal forms and invariants of elliptic surfaces” *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **225** (1977), 259–266.

[14] Kodaira K. “On compact analytic surface. II” *Ann. of Math.* **77**(2) (1963), 563–626.

[15] Kollár J. and Mori S. “Classification of three–dimensional flips” *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **5** (1992), 533–703.

[16] Lichtenbaum S. and Schlessinger M. “On the cotangent complex of a morphism” *Trans. A.M.S.* **128**, 41–70 (1967).

[17] Miranda R. “The moduli of Weierstrass fibrations over $\mathbb{P}^1$” *Math. Ann.* **255**(3) (1981), 379–394.

[18] Miranda R. and Persson U. “On extremal rational elliptic surfaces” *Math. Z.* **193**(4) (1986), 537–558.

[19] Namikawa Y. "Stratified local moduli of Calabi-Yau threefolds" *Topology* **41**(6) (2002), 1219–1237.
[20] Palamodov V. P. "The existence of versal deformations of complex spaces" *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **206** (1972), 538–541.
[21] Palamodov V. P. "Deformations of complex spaces" *Russian Math. Surveys* **31**(3) (1976), 129–197; from russian *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **31**(3) (1976), 129–194.
[22] Ran Z. "Deformations of manifolds with torsion or negative canonical bundle" *J.Alg.Geom.* **1** (1992), 279–291.
[23] Reid M. "The moduli space of 3–folds with $K = 0$ may neverthless be irreducible" *Math. Ann.* **287** (1987), 329–334.
[24] Rossi M. "Geometric transitions" *J. Geom. Phys.* **56**(9) (2006), 1940–1983.
[25] Rossi M. "Homological type of geometric transitions" *Geom. Dedicata* **151** (2011), 323–359.
[26] Schoen C. "On fiber products of rational elliptic surfaces with section" *Math. Z.* **197**(2) (1988), 177–199.
[27] Schlessinger M. "Rigidity of quotient singularities" *Invent. Math.* **14** (1971), 17–26.
[28] Strominger A. "Massless black holes and conifolds in string theory" *Nucl. Phys.* **B451** (1995), 97–109; `hep-th/9504145`.
[29] Wahl, J.M. "Equisingular deformations of normal surface singularities, I" *Ann. of Math.* **104** (1976), 325–356.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Torino, via Carlo Alberto 10, 10123 Torino

*E-mail address*: `michele.rossi@unito.it`